Ham-Policy Digest   Thu, 1 Sep 94   Volume 94 : Issue 411

Today's Topics:
                    Learning CW, a newbie view
                    Repeaters Make M0ney Fa$t

We trust that readers are intelligent enough to realize that all text
herein consists of personal comments and does not represent the official
policies or positions of any party. Your mileage may vary. So there.

Date: 31 Aug 1994 16:27:21 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!library.ucla.edu!europa.eng.gtefsd.com!news.umbc.edu!eff!
news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!sedona!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Learning CW, a newbie view
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <bmicales.252.2E63E9CB@facstaff.wisc.edu>,
Bruce Micales <bmicales@facstaff.wisc.edu> wrote:
>
>What elements would you require for this second no-code license? Which
>bands would this new no-code license be allowed to operate?
>Bruce Micales

I would suggest Novice plus General HF Phone priviledges for
anyone who has passed all the written tests through Extra and 5 wpm
CW. This would not disturb the precious CW portions of the bands at
all. I can't even imagine a rational counter-argument.

73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC (Not speaking for Intel)

--

Intel, Corp.
5000 W. Chandler Blvd.
Chandler, AZ 85226

Date: 31 Aug 1994 05:16:50 -0500
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!news.uh.edu!uuneo.neosoft.com!Starbase.NeoSoft.COM!
nobody@network.ucsd.edu
Subject: Repeaters Make M0ney Fa$t
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

In article <778281475snx@skyld.grendel.com>,
Jeffrey D. Angus <jangus@skyld.grendel.com> wrote:
> Pretty simple actually, the "great unwashed" are too stupid to understand
> so they are excluded from the meetings. In the case of SCRRBA in Southern
> California that "great unwashed" extends to EVERYONE not on their board.

If this is _really_ their attitude, then I can understand why some people are
unhappy with them. It's been my experience that once someone sees the process
in action, they understand better why decisions are made the way they are.

My first reaction when someone gripes about the local coordinating group is to
ask if they've ever offered to help. Most dont. They'd rather whine about it.
It's really too bad.

--

    Jim Reese, WD5IYT | Chief Engineer, KODA Sunny 99.1 FM
   jreese@neosoft.com | "Not responsible for program content..."

Date: 31 Aug 1994 13:41:03 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!howland.reston.ans.net!vixen.cso.uiuc.edu!
newsrelay.iastate.edu!news.iastate.edu!wjturner@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.172.2E6351EC@ornl.gov>, <33vqjn$n3v@news.iastate.edu>,
<wyn.173.2E6383CC@ornl.gov>s
Subject : Re: More Code.

In article <wyn.173.2E6383CC@ornl.gov> wyn@ornl.gov (C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX)
writes:
>If you consider the density of CW QSO's vs other non-voice QSO's in the
>RTTY/CW/DATA subbands on HF then you cannot extend the "exact same
>argument". Why? Because the odds are it will be a CW QSO you land on,

>not a RTTY or DATA QSO.

OK, so why require morse code for phone bands? Odds are you won't land
on a CW QSO?

Date: Wed, 31 Aug 1994 11:27:49 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!usc!nic-nac.CSU.net!charnel.ecst.csuchico.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!world!drt@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3412.2427@channel1.com>,
<33uksl$i1h$1@mhadf.inhouse.compuserve.com>, <340oeh$lrr@jupiter.planet.net>i.com
Subject : Re: Life's not a beach

Bill Sohl Budd Lake (billsohl@earth.planet.net) wrote:

: Note, the FCC stopped issuing Station licenses and now only issues
: operator licenses. That has been reported in QST and this newsgroup
: some time ago.

Well, they stopped specifying station locations, which is different.
Read the back of your license. When a callsign is included (which is
always, BTW), it's a station license. When operator privileges are
included, it's an operator license. Club licenses are station
licenses only, for example. Now, it's true that at the moment the FCC
is only issuing new primary licenses, and they're only renewing club
licenses - that will change soon (hopefully). But every primary
license still includes a station license - which is a good thing,
since the rules still require one.

Of course, that's not cast in stone. A while ago the ARRL proposed
that the FCC extend the term of the operator license for life. This
would mean that if your license expired you could still operate
another station or reapply for a station license of your own. The
reason for this maneuver is that station licenses are limited by
statute to 10 years, but there's no limit on operator license terms,
so the FCC could do it without Congressional action. The proposal
seems no have gone nowhere, though.

-drt

|David R. Tucker   KG2S   8P9CL   drt@world.std.com|

In article <33vuv7$c4b@dancer.cc.bellcore.com> whs70@dancer.cc.bellcore.com
(sohl,william h) writes:

>Please, that is one of the most inane statements I've seen yet (IMHO).
>To think that any ham, new or otherwise, would not even recognise a
>CW QSO as a valid signal...give us all a break. Even the non-ham,
>when s/he hears CW (i.e. on those rare occasions when it is part of
>a TV movie, etc.) seems to be smart enough to know that it is Morse
>code.

IMHO: Perhaps 30 wpm CW sounds entirely different than 5 wpm CW, particularly
after 38 years.

If you would read some of the posts over on r.r.a.d.m. where they are asking
for a description of this or that mode carrier should sound like when tuning
their radios, maybe you would not be so quick to leap to the conclusion that
everyone recognizes CW when they hear it. Why is this? Could it be becaus
there are false elmers in sheeps clothing out there that discourage advancement
by heaping derision on CW ops., or sell the idea that improving and advancing
in CW is foolish because just around the corner there is a free lunch, ie. no
code and little theory advanced and extra license?

Well guess what Mr. Ahl. It is not working. Why don't you join me on the
40 meter novice band and QSO all those fine ladies and gentlemen who, inspite
of all the anti-code rhetoric here, have made the commitment to advance by
improving their code speed and making CW on-the-air contacts. Their can-do
attitude is inspirational. It is in the great tradition of the American
spirit, and works wonders to overcome the feeling of despair that one gets
when reading some of the anti-code posts here. What would your message be to
them?

One of the greatest treats for me is to be the first CW contact for some of
these new ops. It is a real kick to exchange QSL cards with them and read
some of the notes of appreciation. I have two first time contacts confirmed
this year and am looking forward to many more. (IMHO)

73,
C. C. (Clay) Wynn, N4AOX

wyn@ornl.gov
```
==========================================================================
= Cooperation requires participation.  Competition teaches cooperation. =
==========================================================================
```

Date: 31 Aug 1994 14:48:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!gatech!newsxfer.itd.umich.edu!zip.eecs.umich.edu!
yeshua.marcam.com!news.kei.com!ssd.intel.com!chnews!sedona!
jbromley@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <518@ted.win.net>, <082894110857Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>,
<CvDnKn.H5E@news.hawaii.edu>s.kei.co
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

In article <CvDnKn.H5E@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman, NH6IL <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:
        {deletia}
>I've read exceptions to this argument: ``Well, *I* started my
>homebrew career by taking a 150 MHz taxi radio and retuning it
>to 2M.'' But that's really not an exception, for:

> - it's *not* homebrew so his statement itself is a contradiction

Well, when I got through with it, its type approval for the
land mobile service was long-gone history. It had acquired
a 10-channel crystal deck, an AC supply, a second 6146 in
the final and put out 75 watts rather than the stock 25.

It was homebrew in the same sense of all those ARC-5 mods
and cannibalizations that were popular in the 50's.

> - you must already have a good electronics backround to
>   successfully carry out a mod like this.

Nope, just enough knowledge to get a technician-class license
to put it on the air. Why do I remember this old radio?
Because it taught me volumes about RF. I didn't have the
background when I started. I did when I finished. That's
what it's all about, right?

Jim Bromley, W5GYJ <jbromley@sedona.intel.com>

Date: 31 Aug 1994 16:12:52 GMT
From: ihnp4.ucsd.edu!swrinde!cs.utexas.edu!convex!news.duke.edu!eff!news.kei.com!
ssd.intel.com!chnews!sedona!cmoore@network.ucsd.edu
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <wyn.110.2E463AF0@ornl.gov>, <33h72s$97c@nntpd.lkg.dec.com>,
<CvDLr4.GK0@news.hawaii.edu>
Subject : Re: What is wrong with ham radio

In article <CvDLr4.GK0@news.hawaii.edu>,
Jeffrey Herman <jeffrey@kahuna.tmc.edu> wrote:

>Thus code testing *is* relevant since about half the QSO's use it.

Since those QSOers were _forced_ to learn CW, that statistic is
meaningless. How many CW QSO's would there be if CW were not shoved
down every ham's throat? (except techs)

>Ever wonder why code has been The `fad' mode for over 80 years? >Jeff NH6IL

Because CW, alone, is subsidized by the federal government? There are a lot
of structures that would collapse without governmental subsidies. In
general, these structures could not make it on their own in the free market,
whether products or ideas. If CW is as good as you say, why are you afraid
to change the requirements. Wouldn't a ham, exercising his/her free will,
choose to learn CW even if it were not required. If so, you have no
argument... if not, you have no argument... except maybe you are just
philosophically opposed to freedom.

73, Cecil, KG7BK, OOTC (Not speaking for Intel)

--
 Intel, Corp.
 5000 W. Chandler Blvd.
 Chandler, AZ 85226

Date: Wed, 31 Aug 1994 09:08:46 GMT
From: news.Hawaii.Edu!kahuna!jeffrey@ames.arpa
To: ham-policy@ucsd.edu

References <40.3245.2427@channel1.com>, <wyn.153.2E5B7B46@ornl.gov>,
<082494184538Rnf0.78@amcomp.com>¸í
Subject : Re: CW ...IS NOW!

Dan flames Clay by mistake:

>To what point if the shore stations can't copy it? Aside from that; the
>use of morse is not the point. And this group is not about pro this mode
>or that. The group is REC.RADIO.AMATEUR.POLICY not REC.SHIP.RADIO.OPERATORS
>and is for POLICY discussions. Let me say that slowly for you it is for
>   P.....O.....L.....I.....C.....Y not the discussions of usefullness of
>modes. Nor is it the place to discuss shipping interests.

Then why didn't you flame Alan W.? He's the one who keeps stating that
ships/shore stations no longer use CW.

>You don't happen to run a maritime radio op school in your part time do
>you? Or just have stock in one?

Why didn't you ask Alan this rather than Clay?

Got to be fair, Dan! Your flame should have been directed at your ally,
Alan.

Jeff NH6IL

End of Ham-Policy Digest V94 #411
****